

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 94 07:29:59 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #610
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Thu, 2 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 610

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal. (5 msgs)
Ham Radio few problem (2 msgs)
ICOM 2SRA mods experience
LIFE SAVING PRODUCT
NICAD CHARGING
QSL Route
TI9JJP / QSL
US License Examination Opportunities Schedule 6/1/94 to 9/12/94
Willamette Valley DX Club

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 2 Jun 94 12:18:33 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The way to approach this is from the financial point of view.
One is not supposed to make money from use of the ham frequencies.
An examination of the financial records of the owners of the closed
repeaters may show why they are so reluctant to open the repeaters and
maybe lose there nest egg. I know they will argue they are saving
for a breakdown or the day they need to replace the repeater. Just a
thought.
ma.

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 13:06:04 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9406021218.AA05653@intrepid.shuttles>,
alexm@intrepid.UCSD.EDU (Mike Alexander X7908) writes:

|> The way to approach this is from the financial point of view.
|> One is not supposed to make money from use of the ham frequencies.
|> An examination of the financial records of the owners of the closed
|> repeaters may show why they are so reluctant to open the repeaters and
|> maybe lose there nest egg. I know they will argue they are saving
|> for a breakdown or the day they need to replace the repeater. Just a
|> thought.

Huh? Who is making money? Do you have any idea how much it costs to run a repeater? Equipment costs are just the beginning. You have to figure in electricity, phone, and site rental, unless you happen to get all of those free - and, I doubt it, as a good coverage repeater is not usually going to be at someone's house - if it is, the coverage will stink, nobody will pay dues to be a member, and the trustee isn't going to make any money ANYWAY.

In the past two years that I've been a repeater trustee, my machine has cost me in excess of \$6,000; that doesn't include all the sweat equity I've put into it where I've not put in some OT at work or turned down a consulting job because I had to work on the repeater for some reason.

I don't mind spending the money. In fact, I don't accept dues from anyone. Why? Because I don't have to put up with their bullshit that way. Once I start accepting money from people, I can't really tell them to take a hike. By not accepting money, and allowing people to operate on my machine through my generosity and goodwill, I can turn around and tell them to get lost if I want to (and I've only done that to a user once in two years.)

Naturally, not everyone is in the financial position to do this. Monthly expenses for some repeaters can be hundreds of dollars. Luckily, with a site up here at the University, I don't have that problem. But, when you start adding in repair and all the other monthly expenses, why shouldn't you have to pay dues? TANSTAAFL.

MD
--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 13:24:03 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> Agreed, the closed repeater owners would have the same rights as the rest
> of us. They simply wouldn't have rights over and above the rest of us,
> namely, coordination for a repeater pair on a closed or private basis.

Refusing a repeater coordination on the basis of its "open" or "closed" status could be considered illegal, as the FCC recognizes "closed" repeaters as being completely valid. By saying that a "closed" repeater will not be granted coordination you are not giving all repeater owners the same rights, you are discriminating against closed repeater owners.

> Once 440 reached the level of openness found on the model band, 2 meters,
> perhaps this could be relaxed.

Why should this be a goal to achieve? Simply because 144/440mhz radios are inexpensive today? If 440mhz doesn't present the level of "openness" you like, then why not move up to 1.2ghz?

> The current 440 coordination group has abused its authority recklessly.
> This can be seen quite clearly by the disuse into which Southern Cal's
> 440 band has degenerated.

The only evidence I have seen related to band mismanagement posted here by those who seek to eliminate closed repeaters from 440mhz are "paper" repeaters being maintained by the coordinating body. And, while I agree that this is improper, there are ways to deal with it above and beyond eliminating closed systems on 440mhz.

> True, but the ones in Southern Cal are happy with the paper radios. If
> not, then why are they coordinated?

The easiest way to deal with paper coordinations is to document no activity on a particular frequency for a month, and when you hear nothing, quietly

place an open system on that frequency.

When the coordinating body complains of "interference", you have sufficient documentation to say "what system?" and keep on operating as you normally do. At that point, the coordinating body can attempt to move things up the chain to get your system taken off the air, however, if you've documented everything sufficiently, you will be able to show that there was in fact no machine on that frequency that was coordinated.

At the same time you put your machine on the air, you may want to take all of your records of inactivity on that frequency and mail a letter to the FCC indicating that you're setting up a machine on that frequency in lieu of there being no active repeater there currently. This way, the FCC has notice, and any complaints from the coordinating body can be easily dismissed.

After your machine is on the air, inform the coordinating body that you have set up a machine on the frequency in lieu of there not being a machine in operation on that frequency in # days.

Several people in the NE area have used this technique successfully to gain coordination in bands with "no" pairs left.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 13:50:32 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

> What is objectionable is that the coordinating body reserves the
> repeater pairs for a small group, thereby discouraging other potential
> repeater trustees from opening OPEN repeaters on 440.

Again, your bias shows. If your statement had been:

What is objectionable is that the coordinating body reserves the repeater pairs for a small group, thereby discouraging other potential repeater trustees from establishing repeaters on 440.

Then I would agree completely with you. Anyone who wants to set up a repeater, regardless of its status, should not be denied such because the coordinating body is reserving frequency pairs for their friends.

> To validate my point, all one needs to do is contrast 2 meters to 440 in
> Southern California. Two meters is bursting with vitality! Many many
> open repeaters with good operating procedures and courtesy, AND LOTS OF
> FRIENDLY QSOS as the order of the day. 440? Mostly dead silence. The
> few open repeaters are very active; so much in fact that it difficult to
> get time on them.

The same is true of this area. But, of the 3000+ hams in RI, what percentage do you think have dual-band radios? Most new hams purchase a 2 meter radio by default, and don't even get on 440mhz until they have "discovered" the band, usually through the help of a friend who has a dual-band radio.

> 440 in Southern California needs a new coordinating body and a new
> coordinating philosophy, it's as simple as that. I propose the following
> as a starter: "If you aren't open, you aren't coordinated."

I'll agree with your first statement, but not your second.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 13:57:08 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!root@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

vanwag@netcom.com (George Van Wagner) writes:

> I have never had a problem
> with membership charges for expanded use priveleges on a repeater.

There is no requirement that membership charges need to be assessed only for "expanded" uses.

> The
> problem that I have is with co-ordinated pairs being used by a small
> group (5 or 6 people) to the exclusion of all others.

The FCC has affirmed that all repeaters are in fact "closed" systems, and the trustee can determine who can and cannot access them.

> There are also a
> large number of paper pairs here in So. Cal. where I have never heard any
> activity whatsoever. Unfortunately, since these pairs are "coordinated"
> they are not available to someone who may want to put up an open system.

This is poor policy, and what I would suggest people work to change. However, if in the process you threaten other, completely valid and operating, closed repeater systems, do not expect to make many friends.

MD

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 14:04:10 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!root@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

> Nonsense, Mike. Part 97 says only that repeater trustees may restrict
> access. There is no distinction in the regs between open or closed repeaters.
> In other words, if someone gets on the frequency, and they happen
> to activate the repeater, the control op has the option of shutting down the
> repeater or activating other measures to restrict usage to all but authorized
> users.

Oh sure, someone can operate on the simplex input or output frequency, but if they take steps to key the repeater knowingly (i.e. use the repeater's PL even though they are operating simplex), then that can and has been construed as interference.

Its a question of intent, and the admitted intent of Roger Bly is not to operate simplex, but to disrupt the operation of closed repeaters because he doesn't LIKE them.

MD

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 14:11:29 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!root@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

> Please cite the relevant rule from Part 97 that disallows the use of a closed
> repeater?

The FCC has stated that repeater owners have always had the authority to deny individuals access to their repeater.

> My recollection is that it simply allows the repeater owner to
> disallow the use of his/her equipment, i.e. the repeater owner may turn
> off the repeater if they choose not to allow outsiders to use the equipment.

If someone knowingly takes steps to key a repeater, even though they have been told not to, then that is intentional interference. You are correct in stating that nobody owns the frequency, and the person is completely justified in operating simplex on the input or output at any time.

However, we're not speaking simply of actions, we're also speaking of intent. Someone may choose to operate simplex on my repeater input, and use the same PL as I have on my machine because it happens to be the same as one they use elsewhere. Does this become intentional interference? Of course not, the person isn't intending to interfere.

That is not what Roger Bly indicated, however. He specifically stated that he and a group of people go on closed repeaters and tie it up with rapid-fire conversation, effectively forcing the trustee to shut the machine down. Since this specifically requires an coordinated effort on their part to disrupt the operations of a machine, I don't know how you can NOT call it intentional interference.

MD

Date: 2 Jun 94 14:07:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: ICOM 2SRA mods experience
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Netlanders,

I'm seeking someone in the SF/Monterey Bay Area that has experience with modifying the ICOM 2SRA for extended transmit. I would greatly appreciate hearing from you if you have performed this mod.

Thanks and 73s....

Troy

```
-----
| Troy T. Pummill, N6XMV          | trop@hls.com          |
| Manager, Applications Eng.     | ...uunet!lanslide.hls.com!trop |
| Hughes LAN Systems            |                          |
| (415) 966-7915                | 1225 Charleston Rd., Silicon Gulch |
| Mountain View, CA 94043       | The preceding drivel is entirely my own!|
-----
```

Invisible airwaves crackle with life, bright antennae bristle with the energy
Emotional feedback on timeless wavelength, bearing a gift beyond price....
Almost free. "Spirit of Radio" - Rush

```
-----
Date: 1 Jun 94 15:54:08 EDT
From: psinnntp!main03!landisj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: LIFE SAVING PRODUCT
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

In article <31may94.3468@rdg.etf>, achroy@sal.rdg.etf (Roy Kirby) writes:

```
> Dear Sir,
>
>           In a recent survey we discovered that most computer literate
> people do not own a entity/soul/mind Biological Unit (a.k.a. a life).
> Therefore we are pleased to announce our company's new product :
>
> -----> *LIFE* <-----
```

What a concept! Maybe you ought to post this over on policy... :)

```
--
Joe Landis - System & Network Mgr. - North American Drager Co. Telford, PA
landisj@drager.com | uupsi5!main03!landisj | AA3GN@WB3JOE.#EPA.PA.USA
Opinions are mine only, and do not reflect those of my employer.
```

```
-----
Date: Mon, 30 May 94 11:01:00 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!iat.holonet.net!dragon!
alan.eldridge@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: NICAD CHARGING
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

For constant voltage (vs. constant current) nicad charging,
what is the volt-per-cell setting?

An excellant article on building a pulse battery charger was published in 73 magazine in the QRP column.
I built it, it works great on gel cells, etc.
The author states in the article you can use it for nicads, as long as you get the voltage setting right.
Too low, you don't get a full charge, too high, you cook the cells.
One source (The DF Handbook) recommend 1.43 V per cell. I've used that on several packs and have gotten a very shallow charge each time.
I've done this right at the terminals, so I know I'm going right to the cells, not through a blocking diode.
Any suggestions?

... To err is human, to moo Bovine.
___ Blue Wave/QWK v2.12

Date: 2 Jun 1994 13:50:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
channel.ecst.csuchico.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!news.duke.edu!
acpub.duke.edu!thomasr@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: QSL Route
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I just bought my copy of the Internationa callsign directory and figured that it plus the buffalo callsign server would give me all the addresses I would need. Wrong!!!!!! I see I now must buy the hard copy of the North American callsign directory.

Until I do so, would someone be kind enough to send me the address for CM6RJ in Cuba?
Thanks again,
Ron Thomas
thomasr@acpub.duke.edu

Date: 2 Jun 94 13:53:28 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: TI9JJP / QSL
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

After being informed of the postal problems and getting another address for QSLing purposes, I shipped off another card last month. TI9JJP is now confirming contacts made.

I got my card yesterday. I don't know about the rest of the TI9s.

73s de Evert WA50JI

Evert R. Halbach WA50JI
Internet - cs-erh@nich-nsunet.nich.edu
Phone - (504) 448-4999
Snail - P.O. Box 2168 Thibodaux, La. 70310

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 13:14:00 MDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: US License Examination Opportunities Schedule 6/1/94 to 9/12/94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

AMATEUR RADIO EXAMINATION OPPORTUNITIES

Special Note: Amateur Radio licenses usually arrive between 8 and 10 weeks after the test session. The FCC considers their processing time to be 90 days--from the date they receive the application. The FCC usually receives the application one to two weeks after the test session (once the VE Team and the coordinating VEC have completed their processing).

Note: Codeless Technician to Technician w/HF upgraders (who pass a Morse code test) will not receive a new license from the FCC. The existing Technician license plus the CSCE conveying the Morse code test credit is the only documentation issued for use of the additional HF privileges.

The following test session information is provided by the ARRL/VEC for the upcoming six to eight week period. For further information, please contact the test session CONTACT PERSON at the telephone number provided. If necessary, you may contact the ARRL/VEC at 203-666-1541 x282 for additional information. Electronic mail may be forwarded to the ARRL/VEC via USENET at "bjahnke@arrl.org" or via MCI Mail to MCI ID: 653-2312 or 215-5052.

Although the test session information presented here does not indicate whether walk-ins are accepted or not, most test

sessions do allow walk-ins. We encourage you, however, to always contact the CONTACT PERSON at the telephone number provided so that the VE Team is aware that you be attending the test session.

STILL NEED TO PREPARE FOR YOUR EXAM?

If you would like information on how to become licensed; or how to locate Amateur Radio clubs, instructors, licensing classes and/or Novice examiners in your area; please contact the ARRL Educational Activities Department (EAD) at 203-666-1541 x219. The EAD can also provide information on recommended study materials. Electronic mail may be forwarded to the ARRL EAD via USENET at "rwhite@arrl.org" or via MCI Mail to MCI ID: 215-5052.

EXAM LISTINGS - DEFINITION OF FIELDS

STATE

Test Date,VEC,City,,Contact Phone,Contact Person

The SECOND field in the following listing specifies the VEC which is coordinating this examination. This single-character designator denotes the VEC as defined below. An "A" (for example) indicates that this examination is coordinated by the ARRL/VEC.

For further information on any examinations listed, or if you do not find any examinations listed for your area, you may contact any of the coordinating VECs below.

A = ARRL/VEC, 225 Main St, Newington, CT 06111; (d) 203-666-1541

The 1994 test fee is \$5.75.

X = Anchorage ARC, 2628 Turnagain Parkway, Anchorage, AK 99517;

(d) 907-786-8121, (n) 907-243-2221 (or) 907-276-5121

(or) 907-274-5546

C = Central Alabama VEC, 1215 Dale Dr SE, Huntsville, AL 35801;
205-536-3904

N = Charlotte VEC, 227 Bennett Ln, Charlotte, NC 28213;
704-596-2168

D = Great Lakes ARC VEC Inc., 3040 Harrison St, Glenview, IL 60025;
708-486-8019

E = Golden Empire ARS, PO Box 508, Chico, CA 95927; No phone.

G = Greater Los Angeles ARG, 9737 Noble Ave, Sepulveda, CA 91343;
818-892-2068, 805-822-1473.

J = Jefferson ARC, PO Box 24368, New Orleans, LA 70184-4368;
504-737-2315. Test fee for 1994 is \$5.00.

K = Koolau ARC, 45-529 Nakuluai St, Kaneohe, HI 96744;
808-235-4132

L = Laurel ARC Inc., PO Box 3039, Laurel, MD 20709-0039;
(d) 301-572-5124, 301-317-7819, (n) 301-588-3924

M = The Milwaukee RAC Inc., 1737 N 116th St, Wauwatosa, WI 53226;
414-774-6999. Test fee for 1994 is \$5.00.

H = Mountain ARC, PO Box 10, Burlington, WV 26710; 304-289-3576,
301-724-0674

P = PHD ARA Inc., PO Box 11, Liberty, MO 64068; 816-781-7313

R = Sandarc-VEC, PO Box 2446, La Mesa, CA 91943-2446; 619-465-3926

S = Sunnyvale VEC ARC, PO Box 60307, Sunnyvale, CA 94088-0307;
408-255-9000

T = Triad Emergency ARC, 3504 Stonehurst Pl, High Point, NC 27265;
919-841-7576

W = Western Carolinas ARS VEC, 5833 Clinton Hwy - Suite 203,
Knoxville, TN 37912-2500; 615-688-7771.

The 1994 test fee is \$5.75.

5 = W5YI-VEC, PO Box 565101, Dallas, TX 75356-5101; 817-461-6443

The 1994 test fee is \$5.75.

EXAMINATION OPPORTUNITIES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES:

07/09/94,A,American Samoa - Mapusaga Village,,684-699-2420,Michael Homsany
07/01/94,A,Bahamas,,809-368-2188,Robert Hagans
06/25/94,A,Columbia,,571-222-8855,Jeff App - B P Exploration
06/25/94,A,England,,44-497-432-14,Iain Philipps

07/16/94,A,England,,081-902-5995,Yves a g Remedios
06/11/94,A,Germany,,08061-38-5831,James Parker, N6ZQZ
07/09/94,A,Germany,,49-0-67253462,Stephen Hutchins, KN6G
06/18/94,A,Papua New Guinea,,,Kyle Harris KE9TZ

GUAM

06/19/94,A,Adelup,,627-646-7611,Harry Y Taguchi
09/11/94,A,Adelup,,627-646-7611,Harry Y Taguchi

PUERTO RICO

06/25/94,A,San Juan,,809-789-4998,Victor Madero
07/30/94,A,San Juan,,809-789-4998,Victor Madero
08/27/94,A,San Juan,,809-789-4998,Victor Madero

US VIRGIN ISLANDS

07/09/94,A,St Croix,,809-778-3156,Frank Jaeger
08/13/94,A,ST Thomas,,809-774-4740,Ronald A Hall Sr

*EOF

Date: Thu, 2 Jun 1994 13:56:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!godot.cc.duq.edu!
nntp.club.cc.cmu.edu!miner.usbm.gov!gerdeman.alrc.usbm.gov!
gerdeman@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Willamette Valley DX Club
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Help

Is the Willamette Valley Dx Club's address still P. O. Box 555?

Thanks
Steve Gerdemann (WB70EE)

Date: 2 Jun 1994 14:09:36 GMT
From: tymix.Tymnet.COM!niagara!flanagan@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqpCto.6B6@netcom.com>, <2si4ff\$q06@tymix.Tymnet.COM>,
<1994Jun1.185836.26274@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>lana
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <1994Jun1.185836.26274@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary

Coffman) writes:

>Ah, a protector of vested interest. No one is after anyone's repeater
>equipment. What they are after is use of *public* spectrum being denied
>them by current squatters under the guise of closed coordinations.

"current squatters under the guise of closed coordinations"?

Gary, are you arguing that the long-standing coordinations of closed systems
are somehow invalid or at least less valid than those of open systems?

Dick

--

Dick Flanagan, W6OLD
dick@libelle.com

w6old@n6qmy.#nocal.ca.usa.na
CIS:73672,751 GENIE:FLANAGAN

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #610
